

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are currently active.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the opening through which the socket extends is not shown. Substitute drawings are submitted herewith showing the opening through which the socket extends.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because the reference numeral 40 does not appear on page 6, lines 26-31. The specification has been amended to obviate this objection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-11, 15, 17 and 18 as being anticipated by Goebel. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner, on page 4, paragraph 7 of the Office Action, states that there is taught a lamp 64 and a transformer 59, where the lamp 64 is either low voltage or line voltage. Applicant respectfully traverses this conclusion by the Examiner.

Goebel teaches in fixture unit D there is provided a circular ballast housing, generally indicated at 59, which supports therein the usual ballast. Around the housing are

members 60 which support circular fluorescent lighting tube 61. Depending from the bottom of the ballast housing 59 are a plurality of metal straps 62 which are secured to gimbal ring generally indicated as 63. Similarly supported within said gimbal ring is a flood lamp 64. See column 7, lines 34-50. It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Goebel teach a transformer. As is clear from the above teaching from Goebel, the numeral 59 refers to a ballast, not a transformer, and supports the fluorescent lighting 61, and not the flood lamp 64. Ballast is necessary for a fluorescent light, not a low voltage or line voltage lamp. A ballast is not a transformer.

Goebel teaches that the ballast is used to support the fluorescent lighting 61. There is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the flood lamp 64, and that there is any need whatsoever for a transformer for the flood lamp 64. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion that the flood lamp 64 is low voltage or line voltage, as is a required limitation of Claim 1. By the date of Goebel, 1953, it is highly unlikely that the flood lamp was low voltage or line voltage, let alone any need for a transformer because in 1953, the technology was such that as far as the applicant knows, a low voltage or line voltage lamp which required a transformer, as found in applicant's claimed invention, did not yet exist.

Accordingly, because there is no teaching or suggestion of any type of transformer, there is no teaching or suggestion of a low voltage or a line voltage lamp, and

there is no teaching or suggestion of a transformer that is used in conjunction with the low voltage or line voltage lamp, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Goebel.

Claims 2-4, 6-11 and 17 are dependent to parent Claim 1 and are patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 15 is patentable for the reason Claim 1 is patentable.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 as being unpatentable over Newbold in view of Rippel. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitation that the lamp socket is held by a gimbal ring assembly attached to the housing. The applied art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, Claim 16 is patentable over the applied art of record.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-4 and 6-18, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

IRWIN KOTOVSKY

By Ansel Schwartz

Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire

Reg. No. 30,587

One Sterling Plaza

201 N. Craig Street

Suite 304

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal
Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450 on 8/18/05
Ansel Schwartz
Ansel M. Schwartz
Registration No. 30,587